

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-21, and 23 are now pending in the application. Claims 7 and 22 are cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 16-23 stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(C), as being in improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicant notes that Claims 16-23, as originally submitted, included additional limitations not appearing in the base claims. However, to expedite prosecution of the application Claims 16, 20, and 21 have been rewritten in independent form. Claims 17, 18, 19, and 23 depend from the new independent claims. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the presently outstanding objections.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dunn (U.S. Pat. No. 6,089,975). With regard to Claim 7, the rejection is rendered moot by cancellation. With regard to Claims 1-6, 8-21, and 23, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a display method comprising projecting a gaming image when a game machine is in a gaming state, projecting an information displaying image when the gaming machine is in a non-gaming state, and displaying a single information

displaying image extended over all image display areas of a plurality of adjacent game machines by dividing and projecting the single information displaying image on the image display areas of the plurality of adjacent game machines when the plurality of adjacent game machines are in the non-gaming state. Dunn does not teach or suggest the display method recited by Claim 1.

In Dunn, a video display screen presents a video with a split view. Dunn, column 4, lines 49-51. While Dunn discusses displaying promotional advertising material on video gaming apparatus units, (Dunn, column 5, lines 1-10) Dunn is silent as to displaying a single information displaying image extended over all image display areas of a plurality of adjacent game machines. Dunn is also silent as to dividing and projecting a single information displaying image on the image display areas of a plurality of adjacent game machines when the plurality of adjacent game machines are in a non-gaming state. For these reasons, Dunn fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the display method recited by Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes that Claims 2-6 and 8-15 each either directly or indirectly depend from Claim 1 which defines over the prior art as discussed above. Therefore, Claims 2-6 and 8-15 also define over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 16 recites a game machine comprising a display apparatus and a main control unit. When the game machine is in a non-gaming state the main control unit causes the display apparatus to project at least part of an information displaying image representing information other than information of a game. The main control unit is in

communication with an information displaying server that causes the information displaying image to be displayed extending over all image display areas of a plurality of adjacent game machines by dividing the information displaying image for projection on the plurality of adjacent game machines when the plurality of adjacent game machines are in the non-gaming state. Similar limitations are recited by Claim 1. For at least the reasons stated above, Claim 16 defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With regard to Claims 17-19, Applicant notes that Claims 17-19 directly or indirectly depend from Claim 16, which defines over the prior art as discussed above. Therefore, Claims 17-19 also define over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 20 recites a game machine comprising a display apparatus including a projection mechanism and a control unit. When the game machine is in a non-gaming state the control unit causes the projection mechanism to project at least part of an information displaying image representing information other than information of a game on at least part of the image display area, based on communication with an information displaying server. The information displaying server causes the information displaying image to be displayed extending over all image display areas of a plurality of adjacent game machines in the non-gaming state by dividing the information displaying image for projection on the plurality of adjacent game machines when the plurality of adjacent game machines are in the non-gaming state. Similar limitations are recited by Claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed above, Claim 20 defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 recites an information display system comprising an information displaying server and a plurality of adjacent game machines. The information displaying server causes the information displaying image to be displayed extending over all image display areas of the plurality of adjacent game machines by dividing the information displaying image for projection on the plurality of adjacent game machines when the plurality of adjacent game machines are in the non-gaming state. Similar limitations are recited by Claim 1. For at least the above reasons, Claim 21 defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes that Claim 23 depends from Claim 21, which defines over the prior art as discussed above. Therefore, Claim 23 also defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn (U.S. Pat. No. 6,089,975). This rejection is rendered moot by cancellation.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

Dated: June 30, 2006

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GGS/BEW/MPD/cn]